

COMMON GROUND



SPRING 1959

VOLUME XIII NUMBER 1

PRICE ONE SHILLING

The Council of Christians and Jews

PATRON: HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

OBJECTS

To combat all forms of religious and racial intolerance. To promote mutual understanding and goodwill between Christians and Jews, and to foster co-operation in educational activities and in social and community service.

Presidents

HIS GRACE THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY	THE RT. REV. THE MODERATOR OF THE FREE CHURCH FEDERAL COUNCIL
THE RT. REV. THE MODERATOR OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND	THE VERY REV. THE CHIEF RABBI

Vice-Presidents

THE RT. HON. LORD COHEN	SIR RICHARD LIVINGSTONE
-------------------------	-------------------------

Joint Hon. Treasurers

THE RT. HON. THE VISCOUNT CHANDOS, D.S.O., M.C.
EDMUND DE ROTHSCHILD, T.D.

Joint Hon. Secretaries

PERCY W. BARTLETT A. G. BROTMAN, B.SC.

Chairman of Executive Committee

THE VENERABLE C. WITTON-DAVIES, M.A.,
ARCHDEACON OF OXFORD

General Secretary

THE REV. W. W. SIMPSON, M.A.

Organising Secretary

D. WALLACE BELL

Education Officer

A. I. POLACK, M.A.

LOCAL COUNCILS

Birmingham, Brighton, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, Chester, Hampstead, Hull,
Ilford, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Middlesbrough, Oxford, Southport,
South Shields, Sunderland, Willesden.

KINGSWAY CHAMBERS · 162A STRAND · LONDON · WC2

TELEPHONE: TEMPLE BAR 9306-7

Cover Photograph

Magnolia blossom at Kew
(Photo: The Times)

COMMON GROUND

VOLUME XIII NUMBER 1

SPRING 1959

MAIN CONTENTS

Tolerance and Religion	- - - - -	Charles E. Raven
Chief Rabbi Hertz	- - - - -	W. W. Simpson
Hungary—Heavy Odds of Survival	- - - - -	S. Roth
The United Nations and Human Rights	- - - - -	G. O. Warburg

Signed articles express the views of the contributors which are not necessarily those of the Council of Christians and Jews.

Inter-Faith Relations in Israel

SOONER OR LATER it had to happen in Israel, as indeed it must eventually happen in every situation where members of different religious or racial groups live together as fellow-citizens. We were not altogether surprised, therefore, to receive a letter from Jerusalem a few weeks ago telling us of the establishment of a "Committee for Inter-Faith Understanding in Israel and in the World."

We were, in fact, very happy to have this news, and perhaps a little puzzled, too. Were we to infer from its title that this newly-formed Committee was proposing to concern itself with inter-faith understanding not only in Israel, but on a world scale? A closer examination of its aims and objects proved reassuring. "With the establishment of the State of Israel," its Manifesto declares, "the problems of relations between members of the Jewish faith and those of other faiths have taken on an exceptional degree of moral and social importance."

So far so good. It follows naturally that the first object of such a body must be, as is also laid down in the Manifesto, "to foster a spirit of brotherhood and tolerance, without impairment of the integrity and identity of each religious group; to conduct educational work on a large scale . . .," and so forth. It is clear from the context that this work is to be undertaken in Israel itself.

COMMON GROUND

But it cannot end there. For Israel is a land sacred not only to Jews, but to Christians and Moslems also, the world over. It is a land in which members of these and other faiths live side by side, and to which others are beginning to make their pilgrimage in ever-increasing numbers. The founding members of this new body are right, therefore, in their insistence that this—and other considerations besides—“tend to invest with a special significance the attitude which the community of Israel takes up on the question of inter-faith relationships.”

It is natural, therefore, and very necessary, that they should set out also “to maintain contact with corresponding organisations abroad; to unite in consultation on current issues; to exchange publications and information.” We for our part are happy to be included among the “corresponding organisations abroad” and look forward eagerly to a growing exchange, not merely of “publications and information,” but of visits between members of our respective groups.

Two other points invite comment. The membership of the Committee, so far as we are able to judge from the list of those present at its inception, is predominantly, if not exclusively, lay. There may be advantage in this at the present stage of the Committee's development. But it is to be hoped that religious leaders, far from being excluded, will be encouraged to take an active part in a task to which, in principle, they have so much to give, and from which their respective communities have so much to gain.

Secondly, the Committee has chosen as its motto the classical answer of Hillel the Elder to the would-be proselyte who asked to be taught the whole of Judaism while he stood on one leg: “What is hateful to thee, do not unto thy fellow.” But lest his questioner should be misled into supposing that it was all as easy as it sounded, the sage went on: “all the rest is commentary: go and learn it.”

And as we ourselves have long since discovered, in this field there are many difficulties to be overcome; many pitfalls to be avoided. In wishing good success to our friends in Israel as they join us in what is after all our common task we should like also to assure them that whatever we have learned in the experience of the past seventeen years we shall gladly share with them.

Tolerance and Religion

CHARLES E. RAVEN

Dr. Charles Raven delivered the fifth Robert Waley Cohen Memorial Lecture on December 11th, 1958. Common Ground is privileged to print this summary of the Lecture, the full text of which is published separately (price 2s.) Dr. Charles E. Raven, D.D., F.B.A., is a former Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University. From 1952-1958 he was Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Council of Christians and Jews.

IN THE remarkable series of lectures on tolerance promoted by the Council of Christians and Jews in honour of Sir Robert Waley Cohen, it was inevitable that sooner or later we should deal with the field in which that virtue has (to our shame) been conspicuously lacking, the basic field of religion. To discuss tolerance in this relation is obviously a delicate business, especially, alas, for the Christian. The recent horrors of Nazi persecution have shown how terrible can be the distortion produced by centuries of hostility, and given an incentive not only to repudiate ancient hatred but to replace it by a radically felt affection and a positive resolve to co-operate.

Tolerance between Christians and Jews has found expression only in very recent times, but it was developing at least a generation before Hitler's pogrom. Professor Burkitt used to ascribe it to the joint influence of Johannes Weiss' work on the New Testament and of Claude Montefiore's Hibbert Lectures and exposition of the Talmud; he argued that the two religions had been given a new insight into their special problems and a new recognition that those problems were similar in character. The foundation and work of the Society of Jews and Christians in 1927 and its publication in 1934 of a first Jewish-Christian symposium *In Spirit and in Truth*, illustrated the value of his contention.

But from the first, along with this intellectual fraternisation, there was a strong practical urge towards the restraint of antagonism and especially the rejection of the widespread but obvious evils of antisemitism and racial antipathies. The remarkable change which has so obviously taken place in the relationship between Church and Synagogue in recent years is in fact largely due to the close partnership created by the efforts of Christians in Europe and

America to assist their Jewish neighbours in rescuing the threatened victims of Nazi persecution, and later to the horror with which the almost unbelievable attempt to destroy the entire Jewish race was received throughout Christendom. Persecution still has the power to defeat its own object, and it taught us not only pity and admiration, but the recognition of the brutality and shame of racial and religious antagonism.

Realisation of mutual ignorance

But beyond the wider aspect of the tragedy there was also a new discovery both of the worth and friendliness of our Jewish neighbours, and a deep consciousness of our mutual ignorance. That has been the starting-point of what has hitherto been the chief work of the Council of Christians and Jews. So, alongside the meetings of scholars, a rewarding adventure was the holding of joint meetings at which teams of speakers explained their different points of view and yet stressed their common ground and the need for closer co-operation. It not only disclosed the widespread misunderstandings and parodies of our respective beliefs and practices, but produced a general recognition of the need to replace prejudice by knowledge and aloofness by sympathy.

It was natural that these meetings should promote and encourage both the development of local Councils and the expansion of central activities, and groups of many kinds, ranging from official branches to deal with local problems to informal meetings for discussion and study, were brought into being.

As the Council developed the question of establishing tolerance ethically, legally and socially soon attracted attention. On the intellectual and religious side the issues, if less immediate, have become increasingly evident. In education, for example, we have seen how far-reaching has been the influence of racial, national, and religious prejudice in perpetuating false interpretations of the past, in fostering resentment and antipathy in the present, and in sustaining divisions and conflicts which are fatal to human welfare in the future.

So too in religion we have the deeply ingrained charges and counter-charges based upon centuries of estrangement and ignorance which have so tragically bedevilled the relations between Church and Synagogue. We who are Christians find that in correct-

ing our appreciation of the Jewish idea of God by discovering the worship and "blessings," the confidence, fortitude and brotherhood that it inspires, we cannot but examine afresh our own acceptance of human depravity and weakness, our easy acquiescence in proclaiming ideals which we make little effort to put into practice, our complacent and often self-centred individualism. And in explaining the quality and reasonableness of our special discipleship, we can perhaps reinforce the prophetic element in Hebrew religion, and introduce to its ethic a more personal and intimate relationship which helps obedience to be quickened into love.

But to suggest these mutual advantages from our partnership is of course to give to tolerance a much more positive character than it usually bears. The history and work of our Council shows, indeed, that passive tolerance is not enough. Co-existence is no adequate policy for a world in which we are all becoming daily more interdependent, and no substitute for the community, the living together as one family in which alone mankind can avert imminent disaster and find fulness of life. And it is in the facing together of concrete situations where the tension is fiercest that we can really hope to transform co-existence into co-operation, and an adventure towards community.

Jewish and Christian studies

A more detailed notice of recent developments will make specific the points in which joint effort would be fruitful. Since the publication of the symposium *In Spirit and in Truth*, a number of papers and several important books have dealt with studies of Jesus. Here we should all wish to pay special tribute to the work of two outstanding scholars, Dr. David Daube, whose contributions are eminent alike for scholarship and for sensitive insight, and Dr. James Parkes, who has devoted his studies and energy so unreservedly to the work of our Council. Equally significant in this country is the joint volume *Jesus in the Background of History* published by two members of our staff, A. I. Polack and W. W. Simpson, in which the first named set out a detailed exposition of first-century Judaism and of the life and teaching of Jesus while his colleague interpolated comments and alternative interpretations. A second book is the recent volume by Samuel Sandmel, *A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament*, a thorough and detailed exposition of the several

books from the standpoint of years of study of Jewish and Christian criticism and exegesis.

From both these works there emerges the need for closer and deeper discussion upon two crucial issues: first the character, teaching and career of St. Paul, so widely misunderstood by Christians and Jews alike; and arising from this the whole theme of the beliefs, practices and divisions of pre-Christian and early first-century Judaism. We are still far too ready to read back into the lifetime of Jesus the reformed religion of Talmudic Jewry and to ignore the changes which the destruction of the Temple, the Roman wars, the triumph of Pharisaism and the purging of Philonic and Hellenistic elements due to three centuries of dispersion had effected since the Crucifixion in the life of Israel. It would, I believe, be a task of real importance if our Council could sponsor the study by Jewish and Christian scholars of first-century Judaism with special reference to the evidence disclosed by the New Testament and in particular by the life and writings of St. Paul.

Understanding between world religions

Such proposals inevitably lead to the consideration of projects which, though they lie beyond our immediate concerns could yet, I believe, benefit greatly from the contribution which our specific experience could make to them, for there is obviously need to extend the new positive concept of tolerance to the whole sphere of the world's great religions.

During the past half-century there has everywhere been a gradual abandonment of the attitude of ignorance and condemnation, a building up of more accurate and sympathetic knowledge, and a dawning recognition that in all religions there is an element of aspiration, based upon an experience of awe and of dependence, and expressing itself in the three modes of cultus, creed and code. In consequence each religion has tended to become conscious of resemblances as well as contrasts, to scrutinise its own traditions in comparison with others, and to shown signs of assimilation if not of conscious imitation. Much that had previously been sacrosanct had obviously to be regarded as temporary and approximate; much that had gone unchallenged for centuries had to be rejected; and thoughtful members of all faiths were exploring the grounds of their convictions. There was a growing realisation that, if the eternal quest

TOLERANCE AND RELIGION

of man for the eternal is the supreme human achievement, then the roads towards that horizon followed by those who come from vastly different physical, geographical and racial circumstances, will inevitably vary and we shall all gain by understanding both the direction of our own paths, and the points at which our paths diverge from, and even seem to reverse, those followed in other great traditions.

There are many evidences in the past thirty years of this change, and of the realisation that abuse of the other man's religion merely raises barriers and obscures the possibility of understanding.

New thinking about missions

First is the change which began to take place in the concept of the missionary work of the Christian churches—a change due partly to the recognition that even among the lower types of African and Asiatic paganism there were elements of value and interest, and that European habits, doctrines, and standards were not always to be imposed as necessarily Christian. Like many other imaginative and generous projects this work was largely undone by the revival of authoritarianism and fundamentalism, and the consequent charges of syncretism and liberalism which accompanied the economic and political collapse of 1930. But now that this reaction has lost its power we can see that the changes then advocated had a real effect which had not been wholly lost.

This new approach also manifested itself in a number of movements largely outside the organised religious institutions, of which the World Congress of Faiths and the Spalding Trust are prominent examples.

UNESCO and religion

One consequence of these developments has been the change of attitude towards religion by UNESCO. At the beginning of its work UNESCO stated that, being international, it could not deal with any particular religion, but that if a proposal were made by a body representative of religion in general, or of the great religions unitedly, it would be treated sympathetically. Hence in June, 1958, there was held in Paris a Conference of Non-Government Organisations to promote the mutual appreciation of the cultures of East and West, and a few weeks later the Colloque Orient-Occident in

COMMON GROUND

Brussels, which gave opportunity for a survey of the fundamental experience underlying and illuminating the varieties of culture, philosophy and religion, and for personal contacts between their representatives in an atmosphere of co-operation and friendship. A similar conference between Christians and Jews of all regions to set out candidly the character of our fundamental religious convictions, not in theological so much as in ethical and social terms, could be almost epoch-making in its significance, even more so if we could gain the support and secure the presence of Islam.

It remains to mention a matter very relevant to all our work, but universal in its significance and, I believe, of urgent, indeed primary, importance. There has never been a time when a true understanding of the nature and realisation of community was more important or more possible of attainment. Everywhere the self-fulfilment and influence of the individual is diminishing as he becomes increasingly dependent upon the worldwide and anonymous co-operation of humanity, and increasingly impotent to resist mass-hysteria and mass-indoctrination.

Need for community

There has never been a time when the basic groupings of mankind were being more universally transformed, when the traditional barriers of race and colour, of class and the social order, sex and sex relations were so evidently in need of reform, and when the claim of St. Paul that in the true humanity there was neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, could be fulfilled.

Even today mankind has received little or no help from its philosophers or its psychologists as to the character of such solidarity or the circumstances which promote it. They have helped the individual to become self-reliant—that is, to attain adolescence but they have not carried him on to maturity, to the discovery that beyond the realised selfhood lies the fulfilment of the self in the fuller life of an integrated community. Still less have they dealt with the corporate evils, the mass-phobias and obsessions, the social blindness and greed and war for which no one individual is responsible and which no one individual can cure.

If a Council like ours, representing and uniting the two great religions of our Western world, could use its co-operative influence and personal friendships to explore and interpret the deeper and

abiding elements of human community, the conditions of its attainment, and the character of its powers, we might make an essential contribution to the understanding and attainment not only of tolerance but of that family life of mankind which we both inherit and for which at last the whole world is ready.

Chief Rabbi Hertz

W. W. SIMPSON

The Council of Christians and Jews was established in 1942. It was part of the greatness of its founders that in the midst of war, and facing all the problems arising in their own communities, they could look beyond immediate issues, and realise the opportunity that even the conditions of war provided, for building a permanent instrument of reconciliation. Common Ground believes that its readers will be interested during 1959 to read about the four men most closely associated with the formation of the Council—Archbishop William Temple, Chief Rabbi Hertz, Sir Robert Waley Cohen, and the Rev. Henry Carter.

SOME YEARS before I first met the late Chief Rabbi, Dr. J. H. Hertz, in person I had come to know him through some of his published works as a lucid commentator on the Bible, a fearless controversialist and a staunch defender of the faith and practice of Judaism.

Already impressed with the earlier volumes of his commentary on the Pentateuch I find that I had the temerity to write to Dr. Hertz in November, 1935, suggesting that copies of his then "forthcoming commentary on Deuteronomy" should be sent to certain Christian religious weeklies for review. My suggestion was courteously acknowledged by the Chief Rabbi's secretary, Mr. J. H. Taylor, who added that "under separate cover, the Chief Rabbi has pleasure in sending you a copy of his 'Affirmations of Judaism'."

I can still vividly recall the excitement with which I read that volume when it arrived, excitement reflected, I was interested to see when I recently skimmed its pages again, by a number of marginal asterisks, ejaculations and question marks! His affirmations, as an exponent of Orthodox Jewry, were as superb, as his

criticism of those who trod the "new paths" of Reform and Liberal Judaism were trenchant. He was neither a respecter of persons nor a puller of punches!

My earliest recollections of the man himself are of two occasions when I heard him preach and a third on which he was proposing a vote of thanks. The first sermon, I remember, was at a Sabbath morning service in the Poets Road Synagogue, at Dalston. Earlier in the service, one of the boys in the congregation had been called for the first time to read his portion of the Torah. Towards the end of his sermon, therefore, the Chief Rabbi turned and addressed himself to this young "son of the Law." "Remember, my boy," he said (and *how* he rolled those "r's" of his) "that as you go out into the world as a Jew, any good that you do will reflect a certain amount of credit upon yourself and upon your people, but any evil you do will bring discredit, not only upon you yourself but upon your people, out of all proportion to the seriousness of what you have done." I was probably the only non-Jew present at that service, but I have never forgotten the sting and the challenge of that phrase "out of all proportion."

The second sermon was delivered at one of those wonderful Sabbath evening services which were once so unforgettable a feature of the life of the old Great Synagogue in Dukes Place. The text and the content of much of the sermon have long since escaped me. One word, however, remains indelibly stamped upon my mind: "Amalek." It was in the mid-thirties, when reports of growing antisemitism in Germany were causing grave anxiety here at home, and it was under the figure of Amalek, whom he presented as a prototype of the modern antisemite, that Dr. Hertz poured out his invective against this threat to the very foundations of our civilisation.

Warning against fraternisation

And the vote of thanks! In November, 1938, the then Lord Melchett had been invited to deliver the Lucien Wolf Memorial Lecture and had chosen as his theme: "The Importance of Jewish-Christian co-operation in the face of modern Antisemitism." As always, this important function had attracted a distinguished audience. The Chief Rabbi was on the platform and to him fell the responsibility of thanking the lecturer.



Chief Rabbi Hertz addressing a meeting of the Council of Christians and Jews. On the left of the picture are Archbishop Temple and the Rev. Henry Carter.

His speech was characteristic of the man. An opening paragraph graciously phrased, expressed gratitude for the lecturer's eloquence, and for the concern which led him to speak on this difficult subject. But—and here the Chief Rabbi warmed to his task—he felt bound to warn his audience against a certain danger he felt to be inherent in what Lord Melchett had been advocating. "For," he continued, "we should never forget that fraternisation is neither desired nor desirable." There followed an eloquent homily on the perils of "fraternisation." Then, remembering that his task was to propose a vote of thanks, Dr. Hertz returned to his original theme with a "nevertheless, we are all of us grateful to Lord Melchett for what he has given us this evening."

This, however, was far from being the Chief Rabbi's first warning against the dangers of "fraternisation." Already in his "Affirmations of Judaism" he had vigorously attacked the "London Liberals" for arranging "Jewish-Christian Conferences." Indeed, his opposition to the London Society of Jews and Christians was to become proverbial. So strong and so mandatory in fact was his opposition that almost alone among the teachers of Orthodox

Jewry, Dr. Herbert Loewe, one of its saintliest exponents both in life and teaching, had ventured publicly to associate himself with the Society.

It was perhaps understandable, therefore, that when in 1941, reports of the setting up of extermination camps in Europe and evidence of incipient antisemitism in this country led many in both the Jewish and Christian communities to feel that there was urgent need for some joint organisation of Christians and Jews, there was some anxiety as to whether the Chief Rabbi, as the leader of Orthodox Jewry, would co-operate. An invitation from William Temple, at that time Archbishop of York, brought him to the first gathering at which the project was discussed. His own deep concern at the realities of the situation did the rest, and when eventually in March, 1942, a public announcement was made in *The Times* of the establishment of the Council of Christians and Jews the name of the Chief Rabbi appeared as one of its joint Presidents.

Even so, the way forward was by no means free from anxiety. At an early meeting of the Council's Executive Committee, when the causes of antisemitism were under consideration, reference was made to some of its religious roots and the suggestion made that the Council should give attention to "the importance of securing a fair presentation in elementary, secondary and Sunday School education of the position of the Jews." When Dr. Hertz, who was prevented by illness from attending this meeting, found reference to this matter in the Minutes, he immediately wrote to Dr. Temple, who in the interval had become Archbishop of Canterbury, expressing his grave concern at what he thought might be interpreted as an unwarrantable intrusion by Jews in the field of Christian religious instruction. He did not deny the reality of the problem: his opposition was only to the suggested method of dealing with it.

Purpose of Council defined

In the end his intervention proved of the greatest possible value to the Council. It led, on the one hand, to the strengthening of Orthodox Jewish representation in the Executive Committee. It also produced an exchange of letters between the Chief Rabbi and the Archbishop in which Dr. Temple set out his now historic

definition of the purposes of the Council as he understood them. That statement, subsequently embodied in the Constitution, has proved our surest guide and most staunch bulwark against the dangers of "religious indifferentism," or, as Dr. Hertz would have called it "fraternisation."

"My own approach to this matter," wrote the Archbishop, "is governed by the consideration that the effectiveness of any religious belief depends upon its definiteness, and that neither Jews nor Christians should in my judgment combine in any such way as to obscure the distinctiveness of their witness to their own beliefs." Definiteness and distinctiveness. These were the qualities that appealed to the Chief Rabbi. They were the qualities which perhaps more than any other were reflected in his own life and work. This did not always make for a quiet life. No one was ever left in doubt as to where he stood on any issue, however much one might differ from the views he expressed. But as he was firm himself so he respected firmness in others and I shall never forget spending an hour one afternoon listening to a discussion between the Chief Rabbi and the Rev. Henry Carter, who was then Chairman of the Council's Executive Committee, on a matter about which each felt strongly, though differently. In the end it was Henry Carter's view that prevailed, but looking back upon the occasion I cannot help recalling Kipling's lines:

"And there is neither east nor west, border nor breed nor birth,
When two strong men stand face to face though they come from
the ends of the earth."

Interpreter of Judaism

But important as was his contribution to the building up of the Council in its early days—and our indebtedness is really very great—I am still disposed to think that in the end his most valuable and perhaps his most characteristic contribution to the cause of understanding between Christians and Jews will prove to have been in some of his writings. I am thinking in particular of his commentaries on the Pentateuch and on the daily Prayer Book of the Synagogue. Though intended for Jewish readers, and especially for the laymen, the non-Jewish reader will find in them an excellent introduction to the Jewish understanding of the Scriptures and to the life and worship of the Synagogue.

COMMON GROUND

But no assessment of the value of his work would be complete without some reference to his little "Book of Jewish Thoughts." Compiled originally for British and American Jewish soldiers and sailors it has become one of the most widely known and greatly loved of all Jewish anthologies. "When I had taken it up," wrote a former Archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson, "I could not lay it down without practically reading it from end to end." It is unquestionably a book from which the Christian has much to learn.

This idea of the Christian learning from the Jew brings me back finally to the point from which we set out: Dr. Hertz's "Affirmations of Judaism" through which I first came to appreciate something of the quality of this "bonny fighter" for the principles in which he believed so firmly and defended so staunchly, and from which I quote the following lines as embodying in a way their author could not have foreseen at the time the spirit and purpose of the Council at whose birth he assisted and whose earliest steps in a difficult field he helped to guide.

"Not only the hallowing of human life," he wrote, "but the hallowing of history flows from the doctrine of a Holy God, who is hallowed by righteousness. And it is only the Jews, and those who have adopted Israel's Scriptures as their own, who see God's world as one magnificent unity from the beginning even to the everlasting, and who look forward to that ultimate triumph of justice in humanity on earth which men call the kingdom of God; even as it is only the Jew and those who have gone to school to the Jew, that can pray: 'Thy Kingdom come'."

One lesson, and only one, history may be said to repeat with distinctness, that the world is built somehow on moral foundations; that in the long run it is well with the good; in the long run it is ill with the wicked. But this is no science; it is no more than the old doctrine taught long ago by the Hebrew prophets.

J. A. FROUDE, 1889
from "*A Book of Jewish Thoughts*"

Hungary—Heavy Odds of Survival

S. ROTH

In our last issue the Rev. W. W. Simpson, in his impressions from behind the Iron Curtain dealt briefly with the position of the Jewish Communities in the U.S.S.R. and Poland. We think our readers will be glad to have Dr. S. Roth's assessment of the Jewish Community in another country behind the "Curtain." Dr. Roth is General Secretary of the British Section of the World Jewish Congress. This article is printed by courtesy of the Editor of "The Synagogue Review."

A JEWISH COMMUNITY that lost 600,000 of its members during the Nazi persecution and had been reduced by a further 50-70,000 through post-war emigration would find survival difficult under any conditions. It is all the more trying under a Communist régime which does not encourage religious observance, violently opposes a Jewish national spirit and Zionism and looks askance at every form of separate communal existence within a monolithic State, the more so if this separate group is part of a larger, international entity.

In spite of these adverse conditions, Hungary is, next to Poland, the country in the Communist orbit in which we find the most virile Jewish community and most active Jewish life. The form of Jewish communal activities is wholly religious. Soon after the assumption of power by the Communists all independent Jewish institutions and associations were dissolved and merged into the religious congregation. The congregations themselves had to give up their former three autonomous trends (strict Orthodoxy, progressive or "Neolog," and the mid-course "Status-quo-ante" that followed the conservative tradition prevailing before the separation in 1835) and were fused into one body. Yet, the 70-80,000 Jews now organised in these uniform congregations found it possible to encompass in this religious frame all kinds of secular, social, educational and cultural activities. This has been made easier by the fact that in spite of the anti-religious ideology of Communism there exists considerable freedom of religion in Hungary, for Jews as well as for other denominations.

Hungarian Jewry's network of welfare institutions is elaborate and can easily stand comparison with many a community in the West. It maintains a Jewish Hospital and a Home for Incurables, an Old Age Home, an Orphanage, and many other charitable institutions. At least twenty per cent of Hungarian Jews have, in one form or another, to be supported by the community. These are,

COMMON GROUND

first of all, the elderly people who came out of the Nazi ghettos completely destitute and lost all the able-bodied younger members of their families, who were deported and never returned. Food for these old people is provided from a chain of soup-kitchens. They receive cash allowances, clothing and gift parcels. The means are partly provided by the State, within the limits of the national welfare schemes, but the majority of the funds come from abroad. In Hungary, as in every other Eastern European country, the American Joint Distribution Committee was expelled in 1953, when the organisation's name was "implicated" in the Moscow "Doctors' Plot," but Hungary was the first Communist country in which foreign assistance to Jews in a different form was again permitted a few years later. As a result of the emigration of 25-30,000 Jews during and after the uprising of October, 1956, the burden of social assistance has enormously increased. The emigrants were chiefly younger people, so that even more old and infirm ones were left to the charge of the community.

Rabbinical Seminary

In spite of their heavily reduced numbers and unfavourable age-composition, Hungarian Jews made a laudable effort not to vegetate simply as a "soup-kitchen Jewry." The visitor to Budapest will find twenty-two synagogues and smaller places of worship in which regular services are held on every Sabbath and in some even on weekdays, with a reasonable attendance. The famous Rabbinical Seminary, which will celebrate its eightieth Anniversary this year and was associated in the past with such great teachers as Bacher, Blau, Buechler, Guttmann, Goldzieher, Kaufmann and Krauss, continues its work—alas, only with 12 students. Today it is directed by Dr. Alexander Scheiber, one of the foremost Judaistic and Oriental scholars in the Jewish world. There are now plans afoot to give new scope to this great institution, which once provided scores of famous rabbis for the whole world, by making it the central theological school for Eastern Europe as a whole. Two Jewish secondary schools for boys and girls exist in Budapest, while religious education is provided in two Yeshivot and a number of Talmud Torahs. There are two excellent and much-frequented Jewish libraries and a Jewish Museum in Budapest. The Central Board of Jewish Communities publishes its fortnightly journal "*Uj*

HUNGARY—HEAVY ODDS OF SURVIVAL

Elet” with a circulation of over 5,000 copies. Yet the most interesting feature of their cultural life are the many Jewish lectures, concerts and other artistic events which take place throughout the country. During the last year 120 such Jewish cultural functions took place, i.e., one Jewish event every three days. A striking example of Hungarian Jewry’s dogged will to survive as Jews could be witnessed in the new “socialist town” of Kazinczbarczika, one of those industrial centres which are being built as part of the Communist economic planning and drive towards decentralisation of industry. A Jewish Kehillah was spontaneously formed among the Communist *avant-garde* which are usually sent to these new towns!

As in the social field, Hungarian Jewry is the first Eastern European community that after a long period of isolation could, through the Claims Conference, benefit from foreign assistance in cultural matters. It was also the first, and so far the only one, to be granted permission to re-establish organised links with world Jewry through affiliation to the World Jewish Congress in 1957. This recent liberal attitude of the Government can undoubtedly be partly explained by some of the changes that have taken place in



BUDAPEST'S MAIN SYNAGOGUE

the country after the uprising of 1956. In spite of the crushing of the revolt the fact remains that Kadar and his team are not Stalinists. On the contrary, they had previously been victims of Stalinist persecution. They are "liberalisers" at heart, but in view of the revolution they could not afford to be liberal in the political field. So they gave vent to their inclinations in other directions, and greater freedom to religious communities was one of them. The Government has, for instance, reintroduced the system of Jewish religious broadcasts. Yet these propitious circumstances would have been of little consequence, had the will and desire to be Jewish not been strong among the Jews themselves. Hungarian Jewry has lost many of its sons, who, upon being granted civic equality by Communism, left the fold of the community and completely merged with the new socialist society. But those whose interest in matters Jewish was more enduring displayed a positive Jewish spirit. Hungary is perhaps the only Communist country which never had a "Jevsekzia," that ill-famed type of Jewish Committee of the Communist Party which was always "*plus royaliste que le roi*" in its zeal of adapting Jewish life to Communist ideology.

Community without a future

Of course, all these institutions and activities are the small residue of a once flourishing and well organised community. But the surprising fact that this residue could be maintained is seldom realised. Yet, in spite of its brave spirit, Hungarian Jewry must be regarded as a community without a future. The process of liquidation is neither so rapid nor so conspicuous as it is in Poland, but, taking a long view, it is there all the same. It must be so because of the catastrophic age structure, the conditions inimical to Jewish survival, and the burning desire of many to emigrate. During the upheavals in the autumn of 1956, twenty thousand Jews left the country within a few weeks. Another 5-10,000 emigrated subsequently with legal passports, when for a few months, until the middle of 1957, emigration to Israel was permitted and relatives could join their families in other countries as well. Now only a trickle of old people is allowed to come out, but there exists a wide-spread urge for emigration.

The recent departures have deprived the community of two "hard core" elements. The remnants of the Zionist Movement all



SABBATH MORNING SERVICE
IN A JEWISH BOYS' SCHOOL IN BUDAPEST

left for Israel and Orthodoxy has practically disappeared. Most of the provincial congregations are left without a rabbi, and the Central Board had to engage itinerant ministers to look after their spiritual needs. Not a single orthodox rabbi remained, and Hungarian Jews had to appeal for one to neighbouring Rumania. These too are factors to be taken into account when judging the prospects of survival.

The motive behind the urge for emigration is not merely dissatisfaction with the social-economic conditions of the country, which have affected Jews, bourgeois by origin and tradition, more than the rest of the population. A weightier cause is anti-semitism. Jew-hatred has deep roots in Hungary. The progroms of the "White Terror" of 1920 that came in the wake of the first short-lived Communist era in Hungary, after the collapse of the Monarchy, are still well remembered. The "Numerus Clausus" Law of 1921, restricting admission of Jews to universities, was one of the worst discriminatory measures before Hitler. German occupation later strengthened and deepened this tradition, and the Magyars co-operated most zealously with the Nazis in annihilating Hungarian Jews. The Stalinist period, in spite of granting legal equality to Jews and making anti-semitism a punishable crime only fostered anti-semitism. Practically all the leaders of the Com-

COMMON GROUND

munist régime up to the revolution were Jews : Matyas Rakosi, the Prime Minister, Ernő Geroe, First Secretary of the Party, Mihály Farkas, Minister of Defence, Zoltan Vás, the economic dictator and Gabor Peter, Head of the Political Police. In the eyes of its opponents the régime became identified with "rootless international Jews" ready to sell the country to a foreign power. Now there are hardly any Jews in the higher echelons of Government and Party.

The feeling of uneasiness and anxiety of the Jews has led to a heavy concentration in the country's capital and to the disappearance of many small communities in the provinces. Of the 70-80,000 Jews in Hungary, 55,000 live in Budapest, making it—after Moscow, London, Paris and Bucharest—the fifth largest Jewish city in Europe. At present there is no overt or official discrimination against Jews, but the masses remain strongly anti-semitic.

The United Nations and Human Rights

G. O. WARBURG

In this final article in the series on human rights Dr. Warburg assesses the importance of the work done by the United Nations in furthering the establishment of human rights throughout the world. Dr. G. O. Warburg has represented the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organisations as a consultant at the European Headquarters of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. He is Secretary of the Foreign Relations Department of the Board of Deputies of the British Jews.

WHEN PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT and Winston Churchill proclaimed the Atlantic Charter in 1941 and in it stressed the four freedoms, they did not yet know the full extent of the atrocities and violations of fundamental human rights perpetrated by the Nazi régime in Germany and in that part of Europe controlled by it. In 1941 they were thinking of the four freedoms as guiding principles of future policy, but apparently did not yet envisage an international programme for the development of human rights.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

When after the end of the war the governments of the world met at San Francisco to draw up the Charter of the United Nations, the full extent of the horror was known. The logical Latin mind was not satisfied with merely laying down a few guiding principles. They asked for more, for a cast-iron system to prevent the recurrence of a nightmare such as Europe had just endured. France, strongly supported by many Latin American countries, demanded that the Charter of the United Nations should place the international safeguarding of human rights on the same basis as the international safeguarding of peace and of economic development. Non-Governmental Organisations, which played an active role at San Francisco, although they had not then been accorded official status, supported the French stand with all their power. They succeeded. The U.N. Charter contains many references to human rights and fundamental freedoms, not only in the preamble but also in several of the substantive articles, particularly in Article 1, which lays down the purposes of the United Nations, one of them being "promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion."

The importance attached to the human rights programme can be seen by another fact. The Charter in general mentions only the principal organs of the United Nations, such as the General Assembly, Security Council, Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council and the International Court of Justice, and it does not mention the various commissions to be set up as subsidiary organs of the various councils—with the sole exception of the Commission on Human Rights. This is referred to in Article 68.

To refer to human rights in the Charter, however, was not enough. What could the United Nations do in order to establish human rights and fundamental freedoms on an international basis?

In the early days of the United Nations, when idealism was still high and when the impact of the cold war was not yet felt by all the organs of the United Nations, an ambitious programme was laid down. A small group of eminent personalities appointed to make plans for the work of the Commission on Human Rights tried to make this Commission into a really influential organ. Its members were to be men and women independent of their Governments with the right not only to draft international instruments, but also to watch over their observation by the Governments. But it was not

COMMON GROUND

to be. The important Governments of the world did not wish any interference with their sovereignty, they did not want an independent commission, but accepted only a commission composed of Government delegates subject to instructions, and they gave the commission the right only to draft international instruments, but not the right to take any action when fundamental rights and freedoms were being violated. Thus already in the early days the hopes of the idealists were dashed and the human rights work of the United Nations was confined to narrow limits.

Triple instrument proposed

Still, there was useful work to be done. The Human Rights Commission at its first session had to decide on the type of instruments it wanted to draft. One group, led by the U.S.A., favoured an International Declaration somewhat on the lines of the Declaration of the Rights of Man, only translated into the international sphere; while another group, led by the U.K., proposed the drafting of an international Convention or Covenant on a strictly legal basis and binding on those countries which signed and ratified it. Other voices, not least among the non-governmental organisations, stressed the need for implementing such international instruments and supervising their application. Eventually, a compromise solution was reached. The Commission decided to draw up an international Bill of Rights consisting of three parts: (a) a Universal Declaration; (b) a binding Covenant; and (c) measures of implementation. This plan was approved by the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly.

The Human Rights Commission got down to work. Three sub-Committees tried to tackle the three parts of the Bill simultaneously, but it was very soon found that the difficulties in preparing a binding convention and in deciding on measures of implementation were so great that they could not be tackled immediately; while on the other hand it was possible to draw up a declaration in a comparatively short time. A declaration only lays down general principles and standards which are to be achieved eventually, but places no binding obligation on any country. The Governments were ready to accept generous principles, provided that no State or person could hold any Government to account if these standards were not upheld. Although by the time of the drafting of the Declaration the cold

THE UNITED NATIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

war between East and West had started, and although the Western countries and the countries of the communist bloc interpreted the terms used in different ways, both sides were quite ready to agree on a set of principles which each of them would interpret in his own way. On December 10th, 1948, the Universal Declaration, drafted by the Commission on Human Rights and approved by the Economic and Social Council, was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations *nem. con.*

In the ensuing years, the Commission got down to the work of drafting the covenant and very soon got entangled in all kinds of political problems. The first draft for a covenant had been prepared by Gt. Britain. It dealt exclusively with those civil and political rights which had already been established for some generations in the democratic countries of the West; but the countries of the communist bloc, and most of the under-developed countries of Asia and South America, laid greater or equal stress on the development of economic and social rights which, as was generally agreed, were more difficult to define in exact legal terms than civil and political rights. When eventually a compromise was reached, namely to draw up two covenants simultaneously, one dealing with civil and political rights, the other with economic, social and cultural rights, a new difficulty arose—this time mainly between those countries which had achieved independence only recently, and those countries still ruling over colonies. Was the right of self-determination of peoples a fundamental human right or not? Year after year this matter was debated with considerable heat.

Difficulties over self-determination

When the Human Rights Commission finally passed the draft containing an article on self-determination of peoples, many of the West European countries, including the United Kingdom and France, abstained and made it plain that they would not be able to ratify a covenant on this basis. After several years the General Assembly is still in the process of laboriously drafting and redrafting the various articles, and it looks as if many more years will pass before a final vote will be taken, and more years yet before a sufficient number of States will have ratified such a covenant.

Very little progress has been made in the matter of implementation. The draft covenants as prepared by the Commission contain

COMMON GROUND

some provisions whereby a State which has ratified the covenant would be entitled to complain to a specially set up committee if another State, which has also ratified the covenant, has violated one of its provisions. Nothing can be done about a State which has not ratified the covenant, and it is widely agreed that even when States have ratified the covenant a complaint by one State against the other will be lodged only if there are political reasons, and not for the sake of human rights. Hitherto all attempts to give individuals or non-governmental organisations the right to lodge complaints or at least to draw the attention of an organ of the United Nations to violations of human rights have been rejected by a coalition of the communist bloc with the big Western democratic powers.

Limited influence

Although the Universal Declaration of Human Rights has now been in force for over ten years, it must be confessed that in the general field of human rights the practical effect of the work in the United Nations has been, to put it mildly, very limited. During those ten years human rights as laid down in the Universal Declaration have been violated all over the world. In many cases actually retrogressive steps have been taken and nobody could possibly say that the United Nations have yet made the world safe for human rights.

Gloomy as this picture may appear, it should not be overlooked that ten years is a short period in history, and that it is valuable in itself that the international community has solemnly recognised the importance of the human rights issue.

Furthermore, it should be stated that the human rights work of the U.N. is not confined to drafting international instruments. In 1953, when the U.S. Government decided, for internal political reasons, not to ratify any international convention which would affect American legislation, the U.S. delegation on the Human Rights Commission submitted a so-called Human Rights Actions Programme, not as a substitute for the covenants, but as a supplementary item. This Actions Programme provides for regular reports by the member States of the U.N. on the development of human rights in their respective countries, studies by rapporteurs or committees on specific rights, and help to new less developed States to develop human rights in their countries by means of seminars etc. This Actions Programme has now been put into practice. Whilst it

THE UNITED NATIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

is too early to judge on the success or otherwise of the reporting system, and whilst the special studies have hardly got under way, it is generally acknowledged that the seminars have been helpful, so much so that the British delegation, which originally expressed doubts as to the value of the programme, publicly acknowledged that they had been mistaken about the usefulness of the seminars.

In addition to work done by the Human Rights Commission, some very effective work has been carried out by a sub-Commission of the Human Rights Commission dealing with problems of discrimination. After a hesitant start this sub-Commission has now undertaken a number of studies on specific problems of discrimination and has produced a detailed survey on discrimination in education, and on the basis of this survey has made a number of recommendations. That sub-Commission has also initiated a study on discrimination in employment, which was undertaken by the International Labour Organisation and has now led to the adoption of a convention against discrimination in employment.

At the time of writing the sub-Commission is studying, *inter alia*, discrimination in the field of religion and religious practices.

Human rights work also embraces some issues which concern the rights of particular sections. It would be quite justified to mention in this context the Convention on the Status of Refugees which was drafted and adopted in 1951 and which safeguards the rights of thousands of refugees in many countries of the world. At the very time this issue of our journal is published, a conference under the auspices of U.N. is meeting to discuss conventions to eliminate or reduce future statelessness, thus attempting to safeguard the human right to have a nationality.

In some respects the daily work of Specialised Agencies, such as the World Health Organisation, the Food and Agricultural Organisation, the Educational and Scientific Organisation (UNESCO) and the U.N. Children's fund, is furthering specific human rights, such as the right to health, to adequate nutrition, the right to education and the right of the child.

It would be correct to say that the U.N. and the Specialised Agencies associated with it have achieved more in their practical work, tackling particular aspects of the human rights issue, than they have achieved in the theoretical field of drafting overall conventions.

Causerie

CANON A. W. EATON

EASTER is the time when the difference between Christianity and Judaism is pointed most sharply. The cry "the Jews killed Christ" has through the ages been responsible, especially at Easter Time, for untold misery and suffering. Today such religious prejudice is not strong, but we delude ourselves if we imagine it has disappeared altogether. It was the root on which modern anti-semitism of the Nazi variety was grafted; and even in this country one still finds an element of religious antagonism in some people's attitude towards Jews. One of the fruits of our Council is the continual drawing together in understanding and friendship of Church and Synagogue. That fellowship should serve to remind the Christians among us that this sacred day in the Christian calendar, in Christian teaching the supreme manifestation of God's love drawing all men unto Himself, is far from being a cause for fostering antagonism but it indeed a time of universal reconciliation.

* * * *

Many people questioned the value of celebrating the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS. They said that the declaration was no more than a restatement of what was already accepted in the liberal democracies, but that it had done nothing to advance the enjoyment of rights in those countries that denied them to some or all of their citizens. Readers of Dr. Warburg's article earlier in this issue will realise that this is not the whole picture. But even if it appeared to have been totally ineffective the Declaration would still have immeasurable value as a statement of principles and as a standard of judgment and endeavour. Neither the Sermon on the Mount nor the Ten Commandments have been put into universal practice, but we do not question their importance. And Judaism at least has shown the value of celebrating the foundation of such statements of an ideal. Can there be any doubt that the annual celebration of Pentecost as commemorating the Giving of the Law has strengthened the Jewish people throughout the ages in their adherence to the principles of Torah, and encouraged them to come closer to its implementation in

CAUSERIE

practice, and has had its influence also on their Gentile neighbours? We can never too often remind ourselves of those things which are good.

* * * *

The establishment in London of an INSTITUTE OF STRATEGIC STUDIES is an acknowledgment that questions of peace and war can no longer be left to politicians and soldiers. Whether in a democracy or under a dictatorship, both politicians and soldiers can operate only within the terms of reference of principles generally accepted in the society they serve. But we are no longer sure what those principles are, either as to the causes that would justify the waging of war, or the means that could be employed in waging it. It is therefore highly important that these questions should be studied both by those who are concerned with the definition of principles and those whose job it is to implement them in practice. Education and religion, as well as politics and the military, are represented in the new Institute. But it is unfortunate that religion is represented only by the Christian Church. Granted this is predominantly a Christian country; but the issue is too important to omit any constructive contribution that can be offered. The deep-rooted emphasis in Judaism on righteousness in the organisation of social relations, and the experience of the Jewish people in the last world war, suggest that the Institute's studies would be assisted if it found room for a representative of the Jewish community.

* * * *

There has rightly been considerable interest aroused both here and overseas at the news of the anticipated arrival in Israel during the next few years of nearly a million MORE JEWISH IMMIGRANTS. Two points come to mind. The Israeli Ambassador in London has stressed the important fact that Israel can easily absorb such numbers of immigrants without in any way giving the slightest cause for being a threat to the neighbouring Arab states—this would be my own impression after visiting the country itself. The second point is the salutary reminder of the readiness of the Israelis to take on a large proportion of the cost of the immigration, by reduced salaries and increased taxation.

Causerie

CANON A. W. EATON

EASTER is the time when the difference between Christianity and Judaism is pointed most sharply. The cry "the Jews killed Christ" has through the ages been responsible, especially at Easter Time, for untold misery and suffering. Today such religious prejudice is not strong, but we delude ourselves if we imagine it has disappeared altogether. It was the root on which modern anti-semitism of the Nazi variety was grafted; and even in this country one still finds an element of religious antagonism in some people's attitude towards Jews. One of the fruits of our Council is the continual drawing together in understanding and friendship of Church and Synagogue. That fellowship should serve to remind the Christians among us that this sacred day in the Christian calendar, in Christian teaching the supreme manifestation of God's love drawing all men unto Himself, is far from being a cause for fostering antagonism but it indeed a time of universal reconciliation.

* * * *

Many people questioned the value of celebrating the tenth anniversary of the adoption of the UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS. They said that the declaration was no more than a restatement of what was already accepted in the liberal democracies, but that it had done nothing to advance the enjoyment of rights in those countries that denied them to some or all of their citizens. Readers of Dr. Warburg's article earlier in this issue will realise that this is not the whole picture. But even if it appeared to have been totally ineffective the Declaration would still have immeasurable value as a statement of principles and as a standard of judgment and endeavour. Neither the Sermon on the Mount nor the Ten Commandments have been put into universal practice, but we do not question their importance. And Judaism at least has shown the value of celebrating the foundation of such statements of an ideal. Can there be any doubt that the annual celebration of Pentecost as commemorating the Giving of the Law has strengthened the Jewish people throughout the ages in their adherence to the principles of Torah, and encouraged them to come closer to its implementation in

CAUSERIE

practice, and has had its influence also on their Gentile neighbours? We can never too often remind ourselves of those things which are good.

* * * *

The establishment in London of an INSTITUTE OF STRATEGIC STUDIES is an acknowledgment that questions of peace and war can no longer be left to politicians and soldiers. Whether in a democracy or under a dictatorship, both politicians and soldiers can operate only within the terms of reference of principles generally accepted in the society they serve. But we are no longer sure what those principles are, either as to the causes that would justify the waging of war, or the means that could be employed in waging it. It is therefore highly important that these questions should be studied both by those who are concerned with the definition of principles and those whose job it is to implement them in practice. Education and religion, as well as politics and the military, are represented in the new Institute. But it is unfortunate that religion is represented only by the Christian Church. Granted this is predominantly a Christian country; but the issue is too important to omit any constructive contribution that can be offered. The deep-rooted emphasis in Judaism on righteousness in the organisation of social relations, and the experience of the Jewish people in the last world war, suggest that the Institute's studies would be assisted if it found room for a representative of the Jewish community.

* * * *

There has rightly been considerable interest aroused both here and overseas at the news of the anticipated arrival in Israel during the next few years of nearly a million MORE JEWISH IMMIGRANTS. Two points come to mind. The Israeli Ambassador in London has stressed the important fact that Israel can easily absorb such numbers of immigrants without in any way giving the slightest cause for being a threat to the neighbouring Arab states—this would be my own impression after visiting the country itself. The second point is the salutary reminder of the readiness of the Israelis to take on a large proportion of the cost of the immigration, by reduced salaries and increased taxation.

COMMON GROUND

In our last issue we shared with our Roman Catholic friends their sorrow at the passing of their spiritual leader. The New Pope, Pope John, has in the first few months of his service greatly encouraged the whole Christian world, not least in his plea for a recognition of each other as within the family of God, and more recently his announcement of an ECUMENICAL COUNCIL. This is a matter of great significance to the Christian world, for any signs of the determination under God really to heal the wounds of Christendom is great cause of humble thanksgiving. Our Jewish brethren are deeply conscious of the significance of these events and hopefully await the day when we can once again have our Roman Catholic friends around the Council table.

* * * *

The death of both BISHOP GEORGE BELL and BISHOP EIVUND BERGGRAV removed from the field of inter-Church co-operation two great protagonists for righteousness. Both held the high office and the honour of Presidency in the World Council of Churches; both have been actively engaged in the fight against antisemitism, Bishop Bell being a valuable member of our Council and a continual spokesman on our behalf. Fellow architects of the World Council of Churches, we offer thanks to God for their courage, wisdom and devotion.

* * * *

A paragraph in *Causerie* last summer about GERMAN HISTORY TEXTBOOKS has brought a number of enquiries about which books were referred to. The comment was based on reports appearing in the Press, and may to some extent have generalised from what we are now led to believe were isolated examples. However, I note with interest Dr. Adenauer's recent remark that much of the antisemitism and neo-Nazism in the Federal Republic is due to the indifferent history books used in the schools, and am glad to note that he is to draw the attention of the Education Ministers in the *Länder* to these inadequacies.

* * * *

It was welcome news to read that the National Council of Women of Great Britain at its recent Annual Conference passed the following resolution:

ABOUT OURSELVES

"The National Council of Women of Great Britain in Conference assembled being convinced that racial discrimination is contrary to the fundamental principles of freedom for which this country stands, calls upon all WOMEN TO FOSTER A SPIRIT OF TOLERANCE and understanding between different sections of the community and urges H.M. Government to use all appropriate measures to deal with causes of misunderstanding and to prevent outbreaks of racial conflict."

To me the special significance of this resolution is the taking by women of a personal responsibility for the fostering of the spirit of tolerance, and only secondly do they ask someone else to do the work. I seem to remember an old saying which the Council obviously believes, namely "the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world."

* * * *

The last issue of *Common Ground* when commenting upon the great MENORAH IN ISRAEL made two foolish mistakes which I hasten to correct. The artist was not Epstein but Ben Elkan, and it stands alongside the Knesset in Jerusalem, and not in Tel-Aviv. Our apologies for printing such obvious errors.

About Ourselves

AS WE GO to print, the Council's Annual General Meeting is about to be held. The speaker this year will be Dr. Albert de Smaele, former Belgian Minister for Economic Affairs and President of the European Division of World Brotherhood. We shall hope to print a summary of Dr. de Smaele's address on "Co-operation Across Frontiers" in our next issue.

Also at the Annual General Meeting will be Herr Kurt Eberhardt, Secretary of the Association of Churches and Religious Societies in

Greater Berlin, an organisation that serves some thirty-four religious groups in Berlin, including Roman Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Churches, as well as the Jewish Community and other religious minorities. A reception for Herr Eberhardt to meet representatives of various religious groups in Great Britain is arranged for February 26th.

THE HULL COUNCIL of Christians and Jews is the latest branch to celebrate the tenth anniversary of its formation, which it did at a dinner

ABOUT OURSELVES

in the Guildhall, Hull, on December 4th. The Lord Mayor of Hull presided over the function, and the guest speakers were His Grace the Lord Archbishop of York and the Very Rev. the Haham. It was a happy and successful gathering, and we congratulate Hull not only on reaching the age of ten, but on having had so very active a life during those years.

THREE LOCAL BRANCHES have met to hear reports from members of the Council's delegation to Israel and the Middle East—Cardiff on February 2nd, when the Archdeacon of Oxford, who led the delegation, spoke on "The Holy Land Revisited," and Hampstead and Willesden in December and January respectively, when Mr. Wallace Bell gave talks illustrated by colour slides he had taken during the visit. All the members of the delegation have continued to be in demand to address other meetings of various kinds and speak of their experiences and impressions.

WE CONVEY OUR SYMPATHY to the Willesden branch of the Council, and to members of his family, on the death of Mr. Horace Thorley, who was President of the branch since its inception. He always took an active interest in all the activities of the branch, and was rarely absent from any of its meetings. His leadership and wise counsel will long be remembered.

THE WILLESDEN BRANCH has this spring arranged two talks on "The Sabbath," the first on March 11th at the Cricklewood Synagogue, Walm Lane, when Rabbi M. Landy will give the address, and the second at St. Mary's Church, Neasden Lane, on April 13th, when the speaker will be the Rev. D. E. Barnes.

THE WORKING GROUP on the Diminution of Prejudice, whose secretariat is supplied by the Council although the Group is sponsored by three non-Governmental Organisations accredited to Unesco, held a meeting at the House of Commons on December 10th, the tenth anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights, when the educational aims of the Group were explained to a number of Members of Parliament. This has led to an approach being made to the Minister of Education in the hope of securing his interest in certain proposals which the Group has been considering with reference to the teaching of Race Relations in the schools and training colleges.

The fourth conference of the Group was held on February 14th at the Royal Commonwealth Society when the subject discussed was "The Psycho-Pathological Aspects of Group Prejudice." The main speakers were Dr. Henry Dicks, M.D., F.R.C.P., and Dr. A. T. M. Wilson, of Unilever House. Both speakers went deeply into the psychological causes of prejudice and their papers proved to be a most valuable and effective contribution to the whole subject.

THE MANCHESTER COUNCIL of Christians and Jews is sponsoring a short conference for Christian and Jewish Youth in one of the residential suburbs of Manchester on the evening of Sunday, March 1st. This is by way of an extended evening, and if successful it is hoped to repeat it in other parts of the city.

THE CARDIFF COUNCIL held its Annual General Meeting on February 25th when the official business was followed by the showing of a coloured film on Israel by Mr. Hornung, a member of the branch, who also gave the commentary.

We regret that owing to shortage of space the Book Notes feature has had to be held over to the next issue of Common Ground.

